76 01922 Addendum

the on

ADDENDUM

to the

MANAGEMENT AUDIT REPORT

of

TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT

[L.A. Dept. of traffic]

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBERTY

JUN 2 1976

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by

C. Erwin Piper City Administrative Officer Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2024 with funding from State of California and California State Library

On January 26, 1976, the City Traffic Engineer prepared a memorandum to the City Administrative Officer concerning the PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AUDIT REPORT.

Because his comments were received too late to be included in the Audit Report, this addendum has been prepared to report his objections.

"My strongest objection to the first draft was the statement under Evaluation that "some engineers expressed the belief that certain intersections are overdesigned and the City has a sufficient number of signals installed, thus requiring a cutback in signal construction activity. This would also result in a reduction of design personnel." The third draft included a revision of the above to read "some engineers expressed the opinion that certain intersections may be overdesigned in that such items as pedestrian heads are installed without regard to the number of pedestrians who use these locations. Also, the opinion was expressed that the City is approaching a time when a sufficient number of signals will be installed. The City Traffic Engineer disagrees with these opinions."

"In none of the drafts was there any identity of the "engineers" who expressed the above opinions. I cannot believe that they were knowledgeable people in the Department of Traffic, as there has been no inventory taken of the entire City to determine where traffic signals should be installed, and the traffic patterns are constantly changing.

"Our Department has primarily responded to requests from the public and other City officials to determine whether or not traffic signals are warranted at specific intersections. We have also analyzed some of the high accident locations where traffic signals might decrease the accident potential, as well as improve the mobility and right-of-way assignment of the traffic elements. I believe it would be foolhardy to express any opinion that the City has reached or is approaching a time when a sufficient number of signals will be installed.

"The third paragraph under Evaluation in the Audit Report should refer to 9900 investigation requests and 98.5 percent answered within 90 days.

"The organization chart in the forepart of this report should show one Administrative Controls and Special Projects Division rather than separating them.

"Also, the total miles of streets shown in the Introduction is approximately 1000 miles too high.

"Under the heading Discussion of Major Problems, I challenge the statement that "modifying the 1600 intersections listed as 'deficient' intersections may not improve traffic safety." Also, the word "improvement" should be used in this instance with respect to our signal construction program. I also challenge the statement in this section of the report that states "studies have indicated that certain types of improvements reduce accidents, while other types have no effect at all on traffic safety." This is not only irrational, but I have no knowledge of any such studies.

"On page 8, the statement is made that "the Department had no program ready for signal construction forces." Admittedly, we were forced to jockey the priorities for new signal construction because we were limited to 30 for the entire City for the fiscal year. Consequently, some of the signals were partially designed by us and Street Lighting, but it was necessary to postpone their installation because of the insertion of new locations for signals with higher priority.

"I believe that your audit recommendations 2 and 4 are appropriate, but I would assign this work to the Administrative Controls and Special Projects Division.

"Your recommendation 11 is that I "submit, as a part of his Department's budget request, the names of the new intersections proposed for signalization so that they may be included in the City's Capital Improvement Expenditure Program." As you know, we submit our budget request on November 1 for the fiscal year to begin on the next July 1. At best, we endeavor to have identified the new intersections to be signalized at the beginning of the fiscal year so that we can have some backlog of plans prepared by us with input by the Bureau of Street Lighting. However, it never fails when we attempt to establish a priority list, that previously unstudied locations with higher traffic priorities become involved.

"At the moment, we have approximately 40 new authorized traffic signal installations which cannot be accomplished during this fiscal year, but if you are going to hold us a program of 30 for the entire City, that we identify not more than 20, so that we will be able to insert higher priority intersections into the program as they are investigated and authorized for installation. . .

"It is also interesting that the audit team did not interview Mr. G. W. Skiles, even though he has been serving as the Executive Officer of the Department and Acting General Manager in my absence. . "



INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY

FEB - 8 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA